

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action of December 12, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Angles et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,811) ("*Angles*") in view of *Prust* (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,623) ("*Prust*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below.

Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, claims a content managing system having a content managing portion comprising a content library for storing files of a plurality of contents provided by a content provider. A library managing means manages the content library. A customer file storing means stores the file of a content of each user to an area assigned to each user. A customer file managing means manages the customer file storing means. The content managing portion and a terminal unit of a user are connected through a network. The content managing portion is operated remotely by the terminal unit of the user through the network so that when the user selects a content linked to a page published by the content provider through the network, the selected content is copied or linked from the content library to an area assigned to the user.

Claims 10 and 19, each as amended, similarly claim subject matter relating to operating a content managing portion remotely by a terminal unit of a user through the network so that when the user selects a content linked to a page published by the content provider through the network, the selected content is copied or linked from the library to a user area in the customer file storage.

This is clearly unlike *Angles* in view of *Prust*. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Angles* does not assign a storage area to each user. *Office Action of 12/12/06*, page 6. Therefore, the Examiner combines *Angles* with *Prust*. However, Applicants submit the combination of references still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed invention.

Prust merely teaches a method and system for accessing a remote storage area. *Prust* allows a client computer to access remote storage devices using standard file management routines (*i.e.*, as if the remote storage devices were local storage devices). *Prust*, Abstract. This is done by defining a virtual storage area for each user, wherein the virtual storage area includes remote memory locations and local memory locations. *Prust* fails to discuss storing content for a user from a content provider. Instead, *Prust* merely describes virtual storage in general. Further, as *Prust* fails to even relate to a content managing system, *Prust* fails to teach operating a content managing portion by the terminal unit through a network so that a content linked to a page published by the content provider through the network is copied or linked from a library to a user

area in the customer file storage.

Thus, although *Prust* describes assigning a storage area for a user, *Prust* fails to even relate to managing content as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, *Angles* in view of *Prust* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed content managing portion that is operated remotely by a terminal unit of a user through the network so that when the user selects a content linked to a page published by the content provider through the network, the selected content is copied or linked from the library to a user area in the customer file storage.

One having skill in the art would not have been taught to combine *Angles* (which purposefully stores content locally at a terminal) with *Prust* (which merely teaches how to perform virtual remote storage) to arrive at Applicants' claimed content managing portion. Referring to *Angles* Figure 4, *Angles* teaches an advertising provider computer 18, which includes an advertisement database 70, and a content provider computer 14. When a consumer computer 12 retrieves a web page 32 from the content provider computer 14 (step D), the advertisement provider computer 18 sends an advertisement from the database 70 to the consumer computer 12 to insert into the web page 32 (step F). *Angles* merely teaches a consumer computer 12 (*i.e.*, a terminal) that has a local storage medium for storing a retrieved web page and advertising inserts.

Accordingly, *Angles* in view of *Prust* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 10, and 19.


Claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 10 or 19 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 10 and 19 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-27 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)